3rd August 1932]

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"May I know, with reference to answers to clauses (b) and (c), whether no exemptions have been granted and whether Government have passed orders on all applications requesting for exemption of certain men of over 30 years service from being made to retire or are their applications still pending disposal?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I am afraid I cannot say."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether the answer relates to the Revenue department or to all departments?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"So far as I am aware, it applies to all departments."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar:—"In view of the hardship that will be caused to junior men in service, will the Government be pleased to turn down all requests for exemptions if they are pending in some cases?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I cannot make any promise of that kind."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"If Government are of opinion that men who have put in 30 years service are to be retired from service, they must also lay down that those who have put in 55 years of service should also be similarly retired."

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I think the answer given to clauses (b) and (c) refers to both. I think those men who have put in 55 years of service also come under this rule."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"In that case, the answer given here to clauses (b) and (c) is not correct. As a matter of fact, I know there are cases where exemptions have been given not once or twice, but even thrice."

Ports

Excess payment of leave allowance to Mr. G. G. Armstrong.

* 72 Q.—B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Mr. G. G. Armstrong, Chairman of the Madras Port Trust, availed himself of leave during the year 1931; if so, for what period;

(b) what is the amount of leave allowance that he drew during the period;

(c) how much of that amount is in excess of the maximum leave allowance allowed under the Fundamental Rules; and

(d) why Government condoned this excess payment to an officer drawing Rs. 3,000 a month?

A.—As the hon. Member is aware the Local Government are merely the agents of the Government of India in regard to this matter.

(a) Yes; 7 months and 12 days.

(b) Rs. 21,677–6–8.

[3rd August 1932

(c) The above amount of leave salary is in excess by Rs. 989–9–7 of the maximum leave allowance he could have drawn had the limits prescribed in Fundamental Rule 89 (2) been applied.

(d) The terms of his appointment did not specifically stipulate that the limits laid down in Fundamental Rule 89 (2) regarding the maximum amount of leave salary would apply to him. The Government did not therefore consider it necessary to insist on recovering from him any of the amount drawn as salary during the leave taken in 1931. They have, however, directed that the provisions of Fundamental Rule 89 (2) should be enforced whenever he goes on leave in future.

Expenditure on the Madras Port Staff Club.

* 73 *Q.*—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Madras Port Staff Club is maintained from the funds of the Madras Port, and if so, what is the annual revenue and expenditure in respect of the Club;

(b) whether a sum of Rs. 4,000 was recently sanctioned for repairs to the roof of the Club; and

(c) whether persons not in the service of the Port are also members of the Club?

A.—(a) The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(b) An estimate amounting to Rs. 4,000 was sanctioned by the Port Trust Board on the 8th May 1931 for renewing the roof of the Trust's premises which have been leased to the Madras Port Staff Club.

(c) Yes; such members are not however active members of the club, but are only honorary members.

Prisons

Compulsory retirement, etc., of officers in the Jail department.

* 74 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the recent rules and orders on retrenchment by means of compulsory retirement, etc., of officers was made applicable to the Jail department;

(b) if so, how many of the gazetted ranks and how many of the non-gazetted ranks were retired, and what the service of each of the persons so retired was; and

(c) if not, why not?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The question of retiring an officer in the gazetted rank is under the consideration of Government. Particulars as to the officers who were retired in the non-gazetted ranks are not available and have been called for.